



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/697,145	10/27/2000	Nickolai Alexandrov	2750-1316P	7089

2292 7590 08/27/2002

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

SHEINBERG, MONIKA B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1631

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/697,145

Applicant(s)

ALEXANDROV ET AL.

Examiner

Monika B Sheinberg

Art Unit

1631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Election

Applicants' election of Group I (claims 1-10), and elected the sequence identified as gene 9 (SEQ ID NO: 812) from gi number 6102641; in Paper No. 6, filed: 20 June 2002, is acknowledged. The claims should be amended to reflect the elected sequence. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (M.P.E.P. § 818.03(a)). Claims 11-20 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Title

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The present title is directed only to nucleic acid molecules and the peptide they encode, whereas in contrast the elected claims also include constructs and recombinant host cells.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101/112

The pending claims have been reviewed in light of the Utility Examination Guidelines and Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1092-1111, Friday, January 5, 2001.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

35 U.S.C. § 101 reads as follows:

"Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title".

Art Unit: 1631

The examiner is using the following definitions in evaluating the claims for utility.

"Specific" - A utility that is *specific* to the subject matter claimed. This contrasts with a *general* utility that would be applicable to the broad class of the invention.

"Substantial" - A utility that defines a "real world" use. Utilities that require or constitute carrying out further research to identify or reasonably confirm a "real world" context of use are not substantial utilities.

"Credible" - Credibility is assessed from the perspective of one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the disclosure and any other evidence of record that is probative of the applicant's assertions. That is, the assertion is an inherently unbelievable undertaking or involves implausible scientific principles.

"Well-established" - a specific, substantial, and credible utility which is well known, immediately apparent, or implied by the specification's disclosure of the properties of a material, alone or taken with the knowledge of one skilled in the art.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention lacks patentable utility due to its not being supported by either specific and/or substantial utility or a well-established utility.

The claimed nucleic acids of claims 1-5 are not supported by a specific asserted utility because the disclosed uses of these compositions are not specific and are generally applicable to any nucleic acid. The specification states that the nucleic acid compounds may be useful as markers, the isolation of polypeptides, hybridization probes, primers, the isolation of full-length cDNAs or genes, which would be used to make protein and optionally further usage for mapping and numerous other generic genetic engineering usages, as well as genetic therapy, such as antisense usage. In fact, the specification summarized modern biotechnology generally but never connects any of the specifically elected sequences to any particular or specific utility. This wishlist desire for a utility for the claimed sequences falls short of a readily available utility. Similarly, protein may be used for detection of expression, antibody production, Western blots, etc. These are non-specific uses that are applicable to nucleic acid(s) and/or proteins in general and not particular or specific to the nucleic acids being claimed. Claims 6-10 depend from 1-5 and thus also lack utility.

Further, the claimed nucleic acids are not supported by a substantial utility because no substantial utility has been established for the claimed subject matter. For example, a nucleic acid may be utilized to obtain a protein. The protein could then be used in conducting research to functionally characterize the protein. The need for such research clearly indicates that the protein and/or its function is not disclosed as to a currently available or substantial utility. A starting material that can only be used to produce a final product does not have substantial asserted utility in those instances where the final product is not supported by a specific and substantial utility. In this case none of the proteins that are to be produced as final products resulting from processes involving claimed nucleic acid have asserted or identified specific and substantial utilities. The research contemplated by applicant(s) to characterize potential protein products, especially their biological activities, does not constitute a specific and substantial utility. Identifying and studying the properties of a protein itself or the mechanisms in which the protein is involved does not define a "real world" context or use. Similarly, the other listed and asserted utilities as summarized above or in the instant specification are neither substantial nor specific due to being generic in nature and applicable to a myriad of such compounds. Neither the specification as filed nor any art of record discloses or suggests any property or activity for the nucleic acid and/or protein compound(s) such that another non-asserted utility would be well established for the compounds. Table 1 only references subsequences and their region location, yet has no description of utility for any of these particular subsequences. In viewing the database entry, no utility is described within the annotations either. Please see accession number print-outs provided. As per the revision history, the sequence entered for the gi number 6102641 has several versions that are updated, nine to be exact. The annotations vary in addition with the information describing the entry. In addition, none of the entries provide a description of the utility of the sequence entry for a "gene 9" at the nucleotide base location described in Table 1 in any of the database entries. So it is unclear as to where the utility relied upon by applicant for gene 9 is described if it was described.

Claims 1-10 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by a specific, substantial, and credible utility, or, alternatively, a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art would not know how to use the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 1631

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 1-10 are directed to encompass DNA gene sequences, and fragments of sequences of the provided sequences, corresponding sequences from other species, mutated fragment sequences, allelic variants, splice variants, and so forth. None of these additional sequences meet the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. The specification provides insufficient written description to support the genus encompassed by the claim. This is a rejection based on a lack of WRITTEN DESCRIPTION.

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111, makes clear that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of *the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*." (See page 1117.) The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed." (See Vas-Cath at page 1116.)

The skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed polynucleotides, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it. The nucleic acid itself is required for gene 9 of the gi number 6102641. See Fiers v. Revel, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC 1993) and Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd., 18 USPQ2d 1016. In Fiddes v. Baird, 30 USPQ2d 1481, 1483, claims directed to mammalian FGF's were found unpatentable due to lack of written description for the broad class. The specification provided only short amino acid sequences.

Finally, University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co., 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1404, 1405 held that:

...To fulfill the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe an invention and do so in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can clearly conclude that "the inventor invented the claimed invention." Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc., 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (1997); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 1012, 10 USPQ2d 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (" [T]he description must clearly allow

Art Unit: 1631

persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [the inventor] invented what is claimed."). Thus, an applicant complies with the written description requirement "by describing the invention, with all its claimed limitations, not that which makes it obvious," and by using "such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc., that set forth the claimed invention." *Lockwood*, 107 F.3d at 1572, 41 USPQ2d at 1966.

An adequate written description of a DNA, such as the cDNA of the recombinant plasmids and microorganisms of the '525 patent, "requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties," not a mere wish or plan for obtaining the claimed chemical invention. *Fiers v. Revel*, 984 F.2d 1164, 1171, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Accordingly, "an adequate written description of a DNA requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it; what is required is a description of the DNA itself." *Id.* at 1170, 25 USPQ2d at 1606.

Applicant is reminded that the claims do not recite the elected SEQ ID NO: 812. The reference to Table 1 is not itself a written description of that DNA gene sequence selected for claims 1-10; it conveys no distinguishing information concerning its identity. No sequence information indicating the subsequence listed as gene 9 appears in the instant application. Only a reference to the segment of a public sequence is disclosed. As described above, Table 1 only references the gi number and a particular subsequence of the full sequence entered in GenBank. The GenBank entry describes specific gene information of the specific sequence in the data entry. In addition, GenBank entries are not static, being subject to updates in both sequence and annotation, the specific nucleotide locations selected for the gene 9 are thus also subject to change. Please see accession number print-outs provided. As per the revision history, the sequence entered for the gi number 6102641 has several "dead" versions that have been updated to the most recent "live" version of January 19, 2001. The original entry (October 15, 1999) stated that it was not the full or final sequence, but a "working draft". The entries between the "live" version and the "dead" version vary in information and sequence entered. The annotations vary in addition with the information describing the entry. Thus it is unclear as to what the applicant regards as the instant invention if the sequences are not the same and the database entry is not static.

Art Unit: 1631

The sequence elected from Table 1 is made up of a particular subsequence of gi number 6102641. Applicant(s) has not provided any direct description of this subsequence. The specification as filed is defective.

At best this is an attempt to incorporate essential subject matter into this application by reference to descriptive information available in the GenBank entry. It is improper because the gene 9 of the gi number 6102641 is essential material to describe the claimed nucleic acid sequences. The incorporation of essential material in the specification by reference to a foreign application or patent, or to a publication is improper. The examiner was unable to find any clear statement of an intent to incorporate this sequence or the entire GenBank entry by reference in the specification. If basis for such incorporation exists, applicant is required to amend the disclosure to include the material incorporated by reference. The amendment must be accompanied by an affidavit or declaration executed by the applicant, or a practitioner representing the applicant, stating that the amendatory material consists of the same material incorporated by reference in the referencing application. See *In re Hawkins*, 486 F.2d 569, 179 USPQ 157 (CCPA 1973); *In re Hawkins*, 486 F.2d 579, 179 USPQ 163 (CCPA 1973); and *In re Hawkins*, 486 F.2d 577, 179 USPQ 167 (CCPA 1973).

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-10 are rejected, as discussed below, under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-5 lack clarity as to the definition of elected sequence, gene 9 of the gi number 6102641. There is no clear and concise function described within the specification that explicitly states what gene 9 accomplishes. All that is known is that it is a nucleic acid sequence of 504 bases from *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Thus the claimed nucleic acids of the gene 9 species (claims 1-5) lack a clear and concise description of the claimed gene 9. Claims 6-10 are rendered vague and indefinite due to their dependency from claims 1-5. Applicant(s) is requested to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of gene 9 that is regarded as the invention.

Art Unit: 1631

Claims 1 and 2 are vague and indefinite as to what is meant therein by the limitation "the complement". A possible interpretation is that the complement must be of the same length and be the full and exact complement of the recited gene 9 sequence. Another interpretation is that any complement is meant including those with less than 100% complementarity, such as 90%, 50%, or even 10%. Clarification of the metes and bounds of the claim is requested via clearer claim wording. In addition, the independent claims 1 and 2 are interpreted to comprise fragments of a complement, and not only full complements. Thus this encompasses even a single nucleotide since a fragment of a complement remains inclusive of a sequence of shorter length with each base pair matched with the base pairs of the elected sequence. Claims 3-10 are rendered vague and indefinite due to their dependency from claims 1 and 2.

Claim 1 is vague and indefinite as to what is meant by the limitation "a temperature from about 40° and 48°C below". A possible interpretation is that the temperature must be about 40°C and about 48°C simultaneously, which is not possible. Clarification of the metes and bounds of the claim is requested; whether the temperature is 40°-48°C or is it 40°C and 48°C at specific points time frames, etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by products O 8878 of The 1990 Sigma Chemical Catalog, corresponding to the instant elected gene 9 (SEQ ID NO: 812) of the gi number 6102641.

In The 1990 Sigma Chemical Catalog product O 8878 is a 5-mer oligonucleotide of poly dC nucleotides. It is noted that these oligonucleotides are fragments in length as required for instant claims 1 and 2, and/or are 100% identical to poly C segments or their complementary respective poly G segments of the instantly claimed nucleic acids. They thus anticipate instant

Art Unit: 1631

claims 1 and 2 via segments therein which are poly C segments of 5 bases, as are present in the SEQ ID NO: 812.

Claim Objections

Claims 1 and 2 are objected to for referencing a Table within the claims (M.P.E.P. § 2173.05 (s)).

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Inquiries

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (See 37 CFR § 1.6(d)). The CM1 Fax Center number is (703) 308-4242.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Monika B. Sheinberg, whose telephone number is (703) 306-0511. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9 A.M. to 5 P.M. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael P. Woodward, can be reached on (703) 308-4028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to Patent Analyst, Tina Plunkett, whose telephone number is (703) 305-3524, or to the Technical Center receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

August 16, 2002

Monika B. Sheinberg
Art Unit 1631

MBS

Marianne P. Allen
MARIANNE P. ALLEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1600
AUI/631